

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants respectfully request entry of this Amendment, reconsideration of this application, as amended, and reconsideration of the June 28, 2007, Office Action.

I. INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants' representatives would like to express their appreciation for the time taken by Examiner Sheng to discuss the pending claims in a personal interview on September 4, 2007. The following remarks include Applicants' substance of interview pursuant to MPEP § 713.04.

II. GENERAL REMARKS REGARDING THE CONTENT OF THIS AMENDMENT

Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 4, 6-31, 33-64 and 66-76 remain pending in this application. Through this Amendment, claims 1, 19, 31, 46, 56, 66-69, 71 and 72 have been amended and claim 76 has been added. No new matter has been added.

Applicants further submit that, for the reasons discussed in detail below, claims 1, 3, 4, 6-31, 33-64 and 66-76 stand in condition for immediate allowance. The various issues raised in the Office Action are addressed below.

III. APPLICANTS' CLAIMS PATENTABLY DISTINGUISH FROM THE CITED ART

The Office rejected the pending claims in this application based on various references as summarized in the following table:

Claims Rejected	Basis	Cited Reference(s)
1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 15-24, 29-31, 33-36, 39, 44-49, 54-59, 63-67 and 71-75	35 U.S.C. § 102(b)	Yashiro (U.S. Patent No. 5,754,169)
8, 9, 37 and 38	35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	Yashiro in view of Higashio (U.S. Patent No. 5,900,869, "Higashio")
11-14, 25-28, 40-43, 50-53, 60-62 and 68-70	35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	Yashiro in view of Sekizawa <i>et al.</i> (U.S. Patent No. 6,239,789, "Sekizawa")

Amended independent claim 1 relates to, *inter alia*, providing focus to a first control element, wherein the first control element is not a parent element including at least one child element. As discussed during the interview, Yashiro fails to disclose the recited features. Yashiro is generally directed to a pen input device, the pen input device including a tablet 1, tablet 1 including a plurality of light receivers 4 which are arranged over substantially a whole tablet surface 10 with a uniform interval to receive infrared rays emitted toward tablet surface 10 by an input pen 2. Col. 4, lines 16-22 and Fig. 1. Yashiro at col. 7, lines 1-10 describes that when input pen 2 is moved toward a position of a particular display/entry item (e.g., “name” as shown in Fig. 5), the region including the aforementioned entry item and the corresponding hand-writing entry frame is fully magnified as shown in Fig. 6. Yashiro at col. 8, lines 11-18 and Fig. 7 describes that an item input processing unit 8b subsequently operates to characterize the predetermined region in the position of the entry item as a hand-writing input region A. Notably, as disclosed in Yashiro at Fig. 7, region A includes not only the aforementioned “name” entry item, but also other entry items or child elements (e.g., “address”, “occupation” and “date of birth”). Clearly, Yashiro fails to teach or suggest the feature of providing focus to a first control element, wherein the first control element is not a parent element including at least one child element as recited in claim 1. Indeed, Yashiro specifically teaches providing focus and accepting input in an element (region A) that includes multiple child elements (e.g., “name,” “address” and “occupation”). Claim 1 is thus patentably distinguishable over Yashiro for at least these reasons.

Amended independent claim 19 recites, *inter alia*, “accepting input in an area of the digitizer representing the first control element, wherein the first control element is not a parent element, and wherein the first control element is separately stylus focusable.” As noted above in the discussion of claim 1, Yashiro fails to teach or suggest a first control element not being a parent element. As such, Yashiro fails to teach or suggest the features of “wherein the first control element is not a parent element” as recited in claim 19. Furthermore, as discussed during the interview, Yashiro fails to provide separate stylus focus to a first control element (wherein the first control element is not a parent element). Instead, Yashiro merely provides focus to an entire region A. Thus, Yashiro fails to teach or suggest the features of wherein the first control element is separately stylus focusable as recited in claim 19. Claim 19 is allowable for at least this additional reason.

Amended independent claims 31, 46 and 56 recite features similar to those described above with respect to claims 1 and 19. Thus, the referenced claims are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 19.

Notwithstanding whether any combination of the secondary references (e.g., Higashio and Sekizawa) and Yashiro is proper, the asserted combinations do not result in the features recited in the above identified claims. Specifically, the cited secondary references do not cure the above noted deficiencies of Yashiro. In particular, neither Higashio nor Sekizawa, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest providing focus to a first control element wherein the first control element is not a parent element including one or more child nodes. Accordingly, claims 3, 4, 6-18, 20-30, 33-45, 47-55, 57-64 and 73-75 which are dependent on claims 1, 19, 31, 46, 56 and 65, respectively, are allowable for at least the same reasons as their base independent claims and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

New claim 76 recites, *inter alia*, “in response to determining that the first control element is not stylus-focusable: determining whether a parent element of the first control element is stylus-focusable, the parent element including the first control element; and in response to determining that the parent element of the first control element is stylus-focusable, providing focus to the parent element including accepting input in the parent element.” None of the cited references, either separately or in combination, teaches or suggests such features. For example, nowhere does Yashiro teach or suggest differentiating between a parent element and a first control element, much less determining whether the first control element and the parent element are stylus-focusable. Higashio and Sekizawa do not cure these deficiencies of Yashiro. Accordingly, claim 76 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Claims 66-72 are dependent on claim 76 and are thus allowable for the same reasons as claim 76 and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

IV. CONCLUSION

If the Examiner believes that a personal or telephone interview will be useful to resolve any issues and/or to advance the prosecution of this application, he is invited to contact the undersigned attorney.

If any fees are required, such as fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, or if an extension of time is necessary that is not accounted for in the papers filed with this Amendment, the Commissioner is authorized to debit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733 for any necessary fees, including any necessary extension fees. Any overpayment also can be credited to Deposit Account No. 19-0733.

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for immediate allowance and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully Submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

By: /Chunhsi Andy Mu/
Chunhsi Andy Mu
Registration No. 58,216

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
1100 13th Street, N.W., Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 824-3000 (Telephone)
(202) 824-3001 (Facsimile)

Dated: September 28, 2007